



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/591,151	11/13/2007	Yingxin Huang	HW 0410776U'S	6168
74365	7590	08/19/2011	EXAMINER	
Slater & Matsil, L.L.P. 17950 Preston Road, Suite 1000 Dallas, TX 75252			D AGOSTA, STEPHEN M	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER			
			2617	
NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE			
08/19/2011			ELECTRONIC	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

docketing@slater-matsil.com

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/591,151	HUANG ET AL.
	Examiner Stephen M. D'Agosta	Art Unit 2617

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 September 2010.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1,4,5,8-10,12-14 and 17-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) 1,4-5,8-10,12-13 and 18-21 is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 14 and 17 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-946)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 9-15-2010 has been entered.

1. Various claims as listed below contain allowable/novel material.
2. Note that claim 14 has been significantly broadened and is now rejected as a USC 102 rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claim 14 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by The Applicant's Admitted Prior Art (AAPA).

As per **claim 14**, Applicant's Admitted Prior Art (AAPA) teaches a method for managing a local Terminal Equipment (eg. laptop) accessing a network, ~~wherein a management list containing an~~ the identity of the local TE is Configured in a Mobile Terminal and a user identity card is inserted in the MT (Figures 1-3 and page 4, L1-2 states that figure 3 is Prior Art access method: “*Figure 3 is a schematic diagram*

illustrating a flowchart of a TE accessing the network using an USIM in the prior art. "., the method comprising:

after receiving an authentication request identity message from the local TE, the MT requiring the identity of the user from the identity card, sending the identity to the TE so that the TE performs authentication with the network by using the identify deciding whether to accept the request (figure 3 shows the Authentication Request Identity message from the network-side to the TE which is sent to the Mobile and an Acquire Status Identity is sent to the SIM card);

after receiving an authentication response message forwarding by the TE from network if the authentication response message is a message of successful authentication, the MT sending key information to the TE so that the TE accesses the network using the received key information; otherwise terminating the procedure (Figure 3 culminates in the Mobile Accepting the identity request and returning an identity to the TE whereby the mobile/TE can access the network. Note that step 311 teaches either an accept/yes message or a failed/no message whereby the failure will result in termination/rejection. The examiner also notes that it would be inherent for a security function to either allow or fail a user's access to a network, hence terminating the procedure is the only other possibility if the user is not authenticated properly);

Claim 17 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over AAPA and further in view of Gehrmann and Haverinen.

As per **claim 17**, the combo teaches Claim 14, **but is silent on** wherein a management list of a local TE allowed to access containing an identity of the local TE allowed to access is configured in the MT, and the authentication request identity message contains the identity of the local TE from the local TE, further comprising:

the MT deciding whether the identity in the received authentication request identity message exists in the management list of a local TE allowed to access;

if the identity exists in the management list of a local TE allowed to access, continuing the subsequent steps; otherwise, refusing to return the identity of the user identity card to the local TE and terminating the procedure.

Gehrman teaches a similar mobile-TE design whereby the mobile and TE authenticate with each other as based on a security/authentication procedure which is "key-based" (Abstract – note that Para #6 teaches that figure 4 shows a correlation between the mobile and which specific TE's it can authenticate to/with: [0064] Referring to FIG. 4, a subscription module or a RAA Client might have several different shared secrets. One particular shared secret is used to secure the communication with one particular RAA Client or subscription module respectively.). Note that figure 1 shows the mobile #106 and TE #101, figure 4 shows a "list" of ID's and Keys which are to be correlated/used while figure 5 shows specifically that a connection is established, identities are exchanged, keys are looked up and authentication is determined (which reads on using an identity listing). Furthermore, See Gehrmann, Para #64, figures 4-5 teach that the mobile looks up each TE to determine if it is contained in its list and if authentication should be performed: [0064] Referring to FIG. 4, a subscription module or a RAA Client might have several different shared secrets. One particular shared secret is used to secure the communication with one particular RAA Client or subscription module respectively).

Furthermore, **Haverinen** teaches a similar "split user equipment" security function whereby the mobile, TE and network authenticate each other in order for the mobile/TE to access the network (figures 1-3 and Para 9-10).

Note that the AAPA, Figure 3 also shows the authentication process which is either allowed or failed/rejected, which reads on the claim.

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to modify the AAPA, wherein a management list of a local TE allowed to access containing an identity of the local TE allowed to access is configured in the MT, and the authentication request identity message contains the identity of the local TE from the local TE, further the MT deciding whether the identity in the received authentication request identity message exists in the management list of a local TE allowed to access; if the identity exists in the management list of a local TE allowed to access, continuing the subsequent steps; otherwise, refusing to return the identity of the user identity card to the local TE and terminating the procedure, to provide a list of only authorized devices that can connect to the mobile for access to the network.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 1, 4-5, 8-10, 12-13 and 17-21 are allowed.

The applicant has amended as per the recommendations of the examiner and he believes the claims to be novel over the prior art of record.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Stephen M. D'Agosta whose telephone number is 571-272-7862. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 8am to 5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jinsong Hu can be reached on 571-272-3965. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Stephen M. D'Agosta/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2617